



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/518,669

07/21/2005

Ulrike Wachendorff-Neumann

2400.0240001

6796

26111 7590 11/20/2009  
STERNE, KESSLER, GOLDSTEIN & FOX P.L.L.C.  
1100 NEW YORK AVENUE, N.W.  
WASHINGTON, DC 20005

EXAMINER

QAZI, SABIHA NAIM

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1612

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

11/20/2009

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/518,669	<b>Applicant(s)</b> WACHENDORFF-NEUMANN ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> Sabiha Qazi	<b>Art Unit</b> 1612	

**-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 8/10/09.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 6-11 is/are pending in the application.  
4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 6-11 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)   | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application                       |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>8/10/09</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

**Non Final Office Action**

Claims 6-11 are pending. Amendments are entered. No claim is allowed.

**Summary of this Office Action dated November 7, 2009**

1. Continued Examination under 37 CFR 1.114
2. 35 USC § 103(a) Rejection
3. Response, declaration and the data in Specification
4. Communication

**Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114**

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 8/10/2009 has been entered.

**Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103**

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

Art Unit: 1612

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 6-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as being unpatentable over ISENRING et. al (United States Patent 6,407,100), JAUTELAT et al (US Patent

Art Unit: 1612

5,789,430) and the present Specification. These references teach the compounds trifloxystrobin, prothioconazole and tebuconazoles as antimicrobial agents, which embraces Applicant's claimed invention.

### **Claimed Invention**

Claim 6 is drawn to a synergistic combination of trifloxystrobin, prothioconazole and tebuconazoles.

ISENRING teaches trifloxystrobin as fungicide. See the entire document especially lines 10-20 in column 1, lines 34-67 in column 6, abstract, and examples.

JAUTELAT teaches prothioconazole and tebuconazoles as microbicides. See the entire document especially example 1 in column 35, lines 27-64 in column 29, lines 1-55 in column 30 and Table 1 in column 14.

Specification discloses that all the compounds used in the combination are known. See lines 1-18 on page 1.

Instant claims differ from the reference in claiming the combination of all three known compounds useful as antimicrobial and antifungal agents.

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of invention was made to combine known compounds for the same purpose in expectation to

Art Unit: 1612

get a better activity. Since all the above cited reference teach the active compounds as claimed it is *prima facie* obvious to combine two or more compositions each of which is taught by the prior art to be useful for the same purpose in order to form a new composition that is to be used for the very same purpose; the idea of combining them flows logically from their having been individually taught in the prior art. In re Kerkhoven, 205 USPQ 1069.

The results presented in the specification on page 11 are not considered synergistic rather it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to combine the known active compounds in different ratios. The difference in synergistic efficacy 78 and compound of formula 1 (trifloxystrobin) efficacy 67 does not represent synergism. The data presented in Table A on page 11 of the specification is *Pyrenophora teres* test on barley (declaration includes two more examples). The synergism as claimed cannot be predicted for the effect on any other phytopathogenic fungi. The Furthermore, the data does not commensurate with the scope of claims.

Applicant's specification discloses that all the compounds in claim 6 are known.

Art Unit: 1612

In the light of the forgoing discussion, the Examiner's ultimate legal conclusion is that the subject matter defined by the instant claims would have been obvious within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

**Response to Remarks, Declaration and the data in Specification**

Applicants' arguments have been fully considered. Rejections not reiterated from previous office actions are hereby withdrawn. The following rejections are either reiterated or newly applied. They constitute the complete set presently being applied to the instant application. The data presented in the declaration filed by Dr. Peter Dahmen has been considered. In example 1 the calculated efficacy **67 and found 78** is not synergistic for *Blumeria graminis*. Example 2 appears to be marginal synergistic for *Fusarium culmorum*. It is clear from the data that the ratio of the three compounds as 1:1:1 does not necessarily will act as synergistic on all the fungi. The claimed subject matter is not limited to such a ratio and fungi. New claims 10 and 11 are drawn to specific concentrations. The combination of the known compounds is considered obvious to one skilled in the art as the difference in efficacy of individual compound of formula I (67) and the mixture of three components (78) is not synergistic.



Art Unit: 1612

Examiner has considered the data presented in specification on page 11. The difference in synergistic efficacy 78 and compound of formula 1 efficacy 67 does not represent synergism. The data presented in Table A on page 11 of the specification is *Pyrenophora teres* test on barley (declaration includes two more examples). The application of the compounds (I), (II) and (III) are 100 g/ha and efficacy is 67, 56 and 22 percent respectively. The synergism as claimed cannot be predicted for the effect on any other phytopathogenic fungi and ratios of the components. Furthermore, because of each compound appears to be well known in the prior art, it would appear that the combination of the compounds would have been obvious in view of MPEP 2144.06 and See Ex parte Quadranti, 25 USPQ2d 1071 (Bd. Pat. App. & Inter. 1992).

The data presented in the specification and in the declaration does not commensurate to the scope of claimed subject matter and does not show any synergism.

See Ex parte Quadranti where it was held that

“Use of materials in combination, each of which is known to function for intended purpose, is generally held to be prima facie obvious, and in instant case, use of combination of herbicides is so notoriously well known as to be capable of being taken by official notice; generalizations such as Colby formula are not particularly

Art Unit: 1612

useful in determining whether synergism has been demonstrated, since formula inherently results in expectation of less than additive effect for combination of herbicides, since there is no evidence that such approach is considered valid by significant number of ordinarily skilled workers in relevant area of technology, and since it could be reasonably argued that in most cases, additive or better than additive results could be expected for combination of herbicides.”

“There is no single, appropriate test for determining whether synergism has been demonstrated for chemical combination; rather, facts shown in each case must be analyzed to determine whether chosen method has clearly and convincingly demonstrated existence of synergism or unobvious result”.

“Assuming arguendo that the differences in values presented are statistically significant, there is no evidence that they represent a true, practical advantage. In re Freeman, 474 F.2d 1318, 177 USPQ 139 (CCPA 1973); In re Klosak , 455 F.2d 1077, 173 USPQ 14 (CCPA 1972); In re D'Ancicco, 439 F.2d 1244, 169 USPQ 303 (CCPA 1971). Also, prescinding from the Colby formula test, which as we have already indicated is at best controversial and in our view probably invalid, there is no evidence that the differences are unexpected. In re Merck, 800 F.2d

Art Unit: 1612

1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed.Cir. 1986); In re Longi , 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed.Cir. 1985); In re Freeman, supra” .

See 201 USPQ 193; In re Kollman and Irwin; U.S. Court of Customs and Patent Appeals No.78-624; Decided March 15; 595 F2d 48

It was held that “Appellants point to various examples of data presented in the specification as establishing synergism at other than the 1:1 ratio. This position is not well taken. This data satisfies but part of the criteria set to determine if synergism exists. For instance appellants point to the test in table I employing 4 lbs. of the ether in combination with 2 lbs. of fenac. However there is no testing of the ether at 6 lbs. nor the fenac at 6 lbs., i.e. no testing of the individual components at the total amount of the combination employed.

See KSR Supreme Court of United States Decision KSR INTERNATIONAL CO. v. TELEFLEX INC. et al. No. 04-1350; 550 U.S.-, 82 USPQ 2d 1385 (2007) where it states that (1) “However, the issue is not whether a person skilled in the art had the motivation to combine the electronic control with an adjustable pedal assembly, but whether a person skilled in the art had the motivation to attach the electronic control to the support bracket of pedal assembly”. (2) "the results of ordinary innovation are not the subject of exclusive rights under the patent laws". In the present case the seed coating as claimed

Art Unit: 1612

would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made.

In summary Examiner concludes that claims and specification does not provide any new concept or invention for the reasons cited above. To emphasize this point Examiner would like to refer to Applicants to Genetech, 108 F.3d at 1366 and Brenner 383 U.S. 519, 536, 148 USPQ 689, 696 (1966)” which states that “a patent is not a hunting license. It is not a reward for research, but a compensation for its successful conclusion” and “patent protection is granted in return for an enabling disclosure of an invention, not for vague limitations of general ideas that may or may not be workable.”

The data does not commensurate with the scope of the claims.

For the reasons cited above applicants arguments are not found persuasive.

Claim 6 appears to be inconsistent for not mentioning the name of the compound of formula (1) which is trifloxystrobin. Other compounds are named in the same claim. Applicant may include the name of the compound.

### **Communication**

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Sabiha Qazi whose telephone number is (571)

Art Unit: 1612

272-0622. The examiner can normally be reached on any business day except Wednesday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Krass Frederick can be reached on (571) 272-0580. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Sabiha Qazi/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1612